

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/902,583	NAITOH, HISAO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kaveh Abrishamkar	2131	

**All Participants:**

(1) Kaveh Abrishamkar.

(2) Thomas L. Jones (Reg. No. 53,908).

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 20 December 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*102 Rejections*

**Claims discussed:**

*11, 15, and 17*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Conklin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,991,881)*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Applicant was advised that independent claims 1, 2, 16, and 18 were allowable for the cited prior art, and if the other independent claims were amended to better define the relationship between the terminal and the central apparatus that they would also be allowable. Applicant authorized the Examiner to make the proposed changes as seen in the Examiner's Amendment..